

Attorney's Docket No.: 02103-355001
Client's Ref. No.: AABOSS06

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FACSIMILE:

OFFICIAL FAX NO: (703) 872-9306

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Number of pages including this page 5

NOV 02 2004

Applicant : William A. Allen
Serial No. : 09/312,916
Filed : May 17, 1999

Art Unit : 2743
Examiner : Laura A. Grier


Title : AUDIO SIGNAL PROCESSING

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attached to this facsimile communication cover sheet is a Response to Restriction Requirement dated August 3, 2004, faxed this 2nd day of November, 2004, to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Respectfully submitted,
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

Date: November 2, 2004


Charles Hieken
Reg. No. 18,411
Attorneys for Application Owner

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Fax: (617) 542-8906
20968155.doc

NOTE: This facsimile is intended for the addressee only and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately call us collect at (617) 542-5070 to arrange for its return. Thank you.

Attorney's Docket No.: 02103-355001 / AABOSS06

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : William A. Allen
Serial No. : 09/312,916
Filed : May 17, 1999
Title : AUDIO SIGNAL PROCESSING

Art Unit : 2743
Examiner : Laura A. Grier

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 02 2004

Mail Stop Amendment
Hon. Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT DATED AUGUST 3, 2004

Dear Commission:

Responsive to the office action dated August 3, 2004, application owner respectfully traverses the requirement for restriction and provisionally elects claims 1-26 and 33-40 in Group I for further prosecution in this application should this requirement be made final.

35 U.S.C. §121 reads, "If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions." Thus, restriction is proper only if the inventions are "independent and distinct." M.P.E.P. headed 802.01, "Meaning of 'Independent', 'Distinct' reads as follows:

INDEPENDENT

The term "independent" (i.e., not dependent) means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed, that is, they are unconnected in design, operation or effect, for example, (1) species under a genus which species are not usable together as disclosed or (2) process and apparatus incapable of being used in practicing the process.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to the above address, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, on the date indicated below.

NOV - 2 2004

Date of Transmission

Signature



Charles Hicken

Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

Applicant : William A. Allen
Serial No. : 09/312,916
Filed : May 17, 1999
Page : 2 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 02103-355001 / AABOSS06

DISTINCT

The term "distinct" means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, for example as combination and part (subcombination) thereof, process and apparatus for its practice, process and product made, etc., but are capable of separate manufacture, use or sale as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER (though they may each be unpatentable because of the prior art). It will be noted that in this definition the term "related" is used as an alternative for "dependent" in referring to subjects other than independent subjects.

The Examiner has not shown that the claims in each group "ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER." Should the requirement for restriction be made final, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rule that the claims in each Group "ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER."

The Examiner has made no showing whatsoever that the inventions are INDEPENDENT. M.P.E.P. 803 provides, "If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

And M.P.E.P. 803.01 provides, "IT STILL REMAINS IMPORTANT FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST THAT NO REQUIREMENTS BE MADE WHICH MIGHT RESULT IN THE ISSUANCE OF TWO PATENTS FOR THE SAME INVENTION."

Manifestly, search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden because prior art related to the audio processing claims of Group I must be searched in connection with examining the audio processing claims in Group II.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has also recognized that "independent and distinct" means "independent and distinct." *In re Weber*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 328 (C.C.P.A. 1978); *In re Haas*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 334, 336 (C.C.P.A. 1978).

Applicant : William A. Allen
Serial No. : 09/312,916
Filed : May 17, 1999
Page : 3 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 02103-355001 / AABOSS06

In a decision dated June 23, 1977, on a petition filed June 13, 1977, Group 1210 Director Alfred L. Leavitt in granting the petition to withdraw the requirement for restriction said:

Current Office policy is not to require restriction between related inventions when no substantial burden is involved in the examination of all claims in a single application.

And in a decision dated 3 December 1993 on a petition filed March 12, 1993, Group 1100 Deputy Director John Doyle said:

Restriction was required between (I)method for epitaxial deposition and (II)epitaxially deposited product (Paper No. 4). However, the examiner failed to present any convincing basis for the holding that the inventions as above grouped are distinct. The claimed inventions must be independent or distinct, and the examiner "must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions . . .". Further, the field of search for the alleged distinct inventions is seen to be coextensive, hence, no serious burden is seen to be incurred by examination of all pending claims. MPEP 803 under "Criteria For Restriction Between Patentably Distinct Inventions".

The Petition is GRANTED.

That claims 1-26 and 33-40 are said to be drawn to an audio processing method/apparatus for detecting number and directional designators of directional input channels, and processing the channels according to a selectable process, said to be classified in class 381, subclass 22, 18 and 97 has nothing to do with the requirements of establishing that the groups are both independent and distinct and that search and examination of the entire application cannot be made without serious burden.

Manifestly, search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden because prior art related to the Group I claims are likely to disclose subject matter related to the remaining claims 27-32 and 41-45, which must be searched in connection with examining claims 1-26 and 33-40. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn. If the requirement for restriction is repeated, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rule that the claims in each group ARE PATENTABLE (novel and

Applicant : William A. Allen
Serial No. : 09/312,916
Filed : May 17, 1999
Page : 4 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 02103-355001 / AABOSSO6

unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER and explain why all the claims cannot be examined without serious burden.

No fee is believed to be due. However, the Commissioner is respectfully requested to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, Order No. 02103-355001.

Respectfully submitted,
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

NOV - 2 2004

Date: _____



Charles Hicken
Reg. No. 18,411
Attorneys for Application Owner

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20968082.doc